

Public Meeting Comment Matrix

Comment #	Public Comments – Public Meeting	Applicant Response
1.	<p><b>Maria Clark - 26 Oak St</b>                      Unfortunately, I was unable to be present for the town meeting on September 17th but have now listened to it online. I fully support growth and development of the town; however, being a resident of downtown Grimsby, I have been impacted by the increased traffic already. I moved to Grimsby in 2015 due to it's 'small town' feel but it will definitely lose that appeal with an 8 story building on an already VERY busy corner. I walk this area everyday with my dog and many times, there are drivers who either don't pay attention or just don't care and myself and my dog have had many close calls with being hit. I cannot imagine the additional traffic and problems this building will add. Parking is already a struggle for visitors in this area and now taking away spaces from the LCBO parking lot, adds increased struggles for parking. The trucks that come up and down the hill, plus adding high volume of vehicles to this building, the roads will be a complete nightmare. When the market is on (which I LOVE), we see an increased build up, or when there is a funeral procession. Can you imagine the delays, the accidents, the road rage this will create. As a pedestrian, I fear that it will not be safe at all as I am already nervous during certain times of the day due to the increased traffic. The view of the escarpment will also be impacted and that is of course such a beautiful view. We are not a big city, we are a small town and by putting a large 8 story building in the middle of the town will be such a disappointment for us all.</p>	<p>The subject site is located in one of only two locations in Grimsby in which the Town has planned to accommodate higher intensity redevelopment and growth. The Town has sought to protect the distinct small town character of Main Street through Downtown by directing growth to these locations away from Main Street but in close enough proximity to support its ongoing vitality. The proposal integrates and adaptively re-uses the existing heritage designated buildings on the site, with a massing that is sensitive to these elements and allows them to remain dominant along the Mountain Street frontage. In our opinion, the proposal will make a positive contribution to the character of the Downtown through both an appropriately scaled built form and the diversification of housing options, allowing more Grimsby residents to stay in the community. Furthermore, an increase to the residential population of the area will support local businesses and organizations.</p> <p>As assessed through the Transportation Impact Study, the revised proposal is expected to add more vehicles to the surrounding road network as would be expected with any new residential development. While these additional vehicles will contribute to traffic volumes on these roads, the assessment indicates that this additional volume is not anticipated to significantly impact the functioning of the surrounding intersections.</p> <p>Mountain Street is a Regional road and is therefore under the jurisdiction of Niagara Region who has</p>

	<p>I strongly hope that the safety of Grimsby residents and visitors means something to you. There are so many other areas that a building like this can go up instead of ruining the beauty and the quaintness of downtown Grimsby. You will lose the people that make this town a friendly, safe place because many residents are already moving due to poor decisions made when it comes to planning.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration. Please do what is best for the town and residents.</p>	<p>reviewed the proposed development and supporting materials and offered no objection to the advancement of the applications on the basis of traffic impacts.</p> <p>As part of the proposed development, the Owner will be dedicating land along the Mountain Street frontage to the Region. This land will form part of the Mountain Street right-of-way, which includes sidewalks, boulevards and the road pavement. The Region will direct the future use of this space, with the possibility of changes to improve pedestrian safety.</p> <p>Along Elm Street, the proposal is set back from the current sidewalk, providing additional space for pedestrian movement.</p>
<p><b>2.</b></p>	<p><b>Brian and Kelly Wiens - 66 Stewart Street</b></p> <p>We attended the online consultation about proposed changes to permit construction of an 8+ story building at Elm and Mountain.</p> <p>We do not support the project or changes to the bylaw based on the proposed building. At risk of repeating some points already made (which we generally supported) here are our thoughts.</p> <p>Context  The Grimsby community is a desirable place to live, however due to our location, existing infrastructure and services, most people will still require a vehicle to live and work for some years to come. The idea of densification cannot occur in isolation of broader infrastructure changes; primarily transportation.</p>	<p>In June 2025, the board of Niagara Transit approved in principle a new Transit Master Plan. As it relates to the Town of Grimsby, the Master Plan provides for new regional transit routes connecting Grimsby to the broader Region, as well as the City of Hamilton. In addition, new fixed local transit routes are planned for the Town by 2030. These significant increases in public transit service in the Town, coupled with the planned Grimsby GO Train Station, will support the Town's anticipated residential growth, which includes planned intensification in the Downtown.</p> <p>Please see comment #1 for a response regarding the traffic impacts of the proposed development.</p> <p>With respect to parking, the proposal has been revised to include additional parking spaces and to reduce the overall unit count, resulting in a higher residential</p>

	<p>Challenge to specific points presented</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The introduction of transit services to Hamilton and/or St Catherines will create some opportunity to reduce driving, but the frequency of service combined with the complexity of connections etc. will limit the viability of public transit to very few people, and take many years for wide adoption. Hence, bikes and commuter buses could be a good idea but have virtually no significant influence for the next 5 to 10 years.</li><li>• The GO train may come someday, and will doubtless be announced again in the next election cycle, but also remains many years in the future.</li><li>• The presenter's pontification about seeing this as opportunity rather than change was condescending and did not address the core issues. There is general recognition that we need to densify strategically, but the arguments presented that this is a strategic build were weak.</li><li>• With a mechanical room and gaudy sign at the top of the main building makes it effectively a 9+ story building, and a visual disruption.</li><li>• The traffic model estimated the proposal will add about 5 years worth of BAU predicted traffic growth, which was not really addressed in the presentation.</li><li>• There will be significant disruption during construction (unavoidable) but will need a plan and we did not hear any acknowledgement of this challenge.</li></ul> <p>Concerns</p>	<p>parking ratio than was previously contemplated (0.95 spaces per unit, compared to the previous 0.68 spaces per unit). The adequacy of the proposed parking supply is analyzed in the Transportation Comment Response Letter prepared by BA Group and will be subject to review by Town staff.</p> <p>Bicycle parking is being provided in the proposed development to support the proposed reduction in parking rate, consistent with the approach taken by communities across Ontario. While on-road cycling facilities in Grimsby may be limited, it is important that new development be planned with consideration for future changes to mobility patterns.</p> <p>After careful consideration and collaboration with the Town, the height of the proposed building has been reduced from 8-storeys (29.8 metres to the top of the main roof) to 7-storeys (26.7 metres to the top of the main roof). The proposed height is consistent with the previous approval that applies to the majority of the site. In our opinion, this height can be reasonably accommodated on the site and is appropriate for an identified intensification area.</p> <p>The previously proposed roof-top destination signage has been removed from the revised proposal.</p> <p>Matters related to construction management and mitigation will be addressed through a future Site Plan Control application.</p>
--	--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient Parking spaces: It remains unrealistic to expect 177 rental units to only require 150 parking spaces. Consequently, the other 50 to 100 vehicles will spill over into public parking or other commercial lots.</li> <li>• Bicycle parking spaces: A good idea but bicycle infrastructure in Grimsby and the broader Niagara peninsula is almost non-existent making cycling a high risk activity for commuting, shopping etc. Many years and substantial infrastructure changes before this is a potential beyond recreational biking.</li> <li>• Height. Eight stories with an additional story of mechanical space is significant and roughly a third of the height of the escarpment. As noted, this would be a significant visual disturbance.</li> <li>• The Wind study.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Niagara Falls International Airport sits above the escarpment and some distance off the lake. The location of downtown Grimsby near a land/water interface on one side and against a sharp topographical feature (escarpment) on the other renders the airport choice very questionable. These wind study choices substantially underestimate the turbulence (gustiness) that would be experienced at this site and does not seem to consider the forcing of a land-sea diurnal wind cycle.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Positive Points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is merit in trying to preserve and link to the existing older buildings.</li> </ul>	<p>The Town's Official Plan requires that height increases be evaluated for their impacts on views of the escarpment. As such, a Visual Impact Assessment was completed for the proposal and has been reviewed by the Town and the Niagara Escarpment Commission. Following this review, as noted above, the Owner elected to reduce the height of the proposed building to 7-storeys and remove the previously contemplates rooftop destination sign, reducing visual impacts relative to the Escarpment.</p> <p>A Pedestrian Level Wind Study was prepared in support of the proposed development and has been reviewed by the Town. While limited areas of potential uncomfortable wind conditions were identified through this study, it is anticipated that these conditions will be improved through the use of targeted mitigation measures. These measures will be further explored as part of a future Site Plan Control application. The resident's comments regarding the location of wind data utilized in the Pedestrian Level Wind Study will be taken into consideration; however, it is noted that analysis is limited to the data available.</p>
---	---

	<p>There is consideration for creating community spaces. Not sure they will be attractive as compared to existing nearby parks</p>	
<p><b>3.</b></p>	<p><b>Karen Filic</b>          Grimsby is a bedroom community that has attracted Torontonians who are commuters. This shows in the congestion on through streets and the highway.</p> <p>The infrastructure is old. Recently there was a water main break. What is the status of aging infrastructure?</p> <p>The size of the units is a concern. Given the number of units and gross square footage it appears that the average unit size would be 500 square feet.</p> <p>There needs to be a variety of sizes to accommodate families not just singles.</p> <p>Also the building must blend into the downtown core. Architectural control must be put in place.</p> <p>I also agree with the traffic on the street speaking as someone who has been t-boned by a runaway fully loaded dump truck and survived to tell the tale.</p>	<p>Please see comment #1 for a response regarding the traffic impacts of the proposed development.</p> <p>Any changes or upgrades to existing infrastructure that will serve a new development are determined by the Town and Region through the review of development applications. At this time, there have been no such improvements identified for the subject development proposal.</p> <p>The proposed development is planned to include a variety of residential units in terms of both size and type (i.e. number of bedrooms). This includes one, two and three bedroom units, with the majority of units (71%) having two bedrooms. The unit mix is subject to future changes based on market demand and a detailed design process.</p> <p>The proposed development will be subject to a future Site Plan Control application and heritage permitting process, both of which will further evaluate the proposal in terms of its fit with the surrounding context.</p>
<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b>Jim Smith - 25 Hazelwood Avenue, Grimsby</b></p> <p>I wish to express my opposition to allowing construction of an 8 story building on the subject properties. Maintain the 4 story limit.</p>	<p>As noted in the response to comment #2, the height of the proposed building has been reduced from 8-storeys (29.8 metres to the top of the main roof) to 7-storeys (26.7 metres to the top of the main roof). The proposed height is consistent with the previous approval that</p>

		<p>applies to the majority of the site. It is further noted that the Town’s Official Plan does allow for heights of up to 6-storeys in this area of the Downtown provided certain conditions are met. In our opinion, the applications have appropriately addressed these conditions.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is noted that the Town’s draft new Official Plan would allow for heights of up to 6-storeys as-of-right in this location, with conditional heights of up to 12-storeys.</p>
5.	<p><b>Elizabeth Sullivan - 108 Olive Street</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns with height, traffic</li> <li>• Skeptical of uptake of cyclists</li> <li>• Concerns with emergency access from fire station</li> </ul>	<p>Please see comments #1, #2 and #4 for responses regarding the traffic impacts of the proposed development and the proposed building height.</p>
6.	<p><b>Cam Agnew, 68 Lorne Avenue</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern with scale and pace of development proposed</li> <li>• Concerns with infrastructure to support increase in population</li> <li>• Roads, parking, etc.</li> <li>• Concerns with timing of developments at the same time and impacts on downtown businesses, parking, etc.</li> <li>• Concerns with transparency re meeting time, circulation, etc.</li> <li>• Opposes the implementation of bus route</li> </ul>	<p>Please see comments #1, #2 and #3 for responses regarding the traffic impacts and infrastructure requirements of the proposed development and the Regional and Provincial plans for transit service expansion in Grimsby.</p> <p>With respect to the transparency of the statutory public meeting, we note that the meeting was hosted by the Town in accordance with their standard practices regarding time and location and with regard to the Province’s requirements for public notice as set out in the <i>Planning Act</i>.</p>
7.	<p><b>Dayna Smith - 2 Deer Park Court</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreement with previous comments</li> </ul>	<p>Please see comment #2 for responses regarding vehicle parking, the previously proposed sign, the evaluated visual impacts with respect to the Niagara Escarpment,</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Village square – question why anyone would want to visit here – don't know what is appealing people to here with traffic</li><li>• Not against increase in density downtown</li><li>• Questions about infrastructure updates and GO Train, cycling infrastructure, ride share</li><li>• Parking – concerns with enough parking spaces for residents</li><li>• Concerns with studios and how many being provided, if there is demand in Grimsby for this unit type</li><li>• Concerns with visual impact assessment and views on the escarpment – full impact shown in the assessment</li><li>• Disagrees with inclusion of the signs on the top</li><li>• Concerns with the wind study and isolated areas identified</li><li>• Affordable housing – restricted to studio apartments or multi bed units? Is a parking space provided</li></ul>	<p>the submitted Pedestrian Wind Study and the Regional/Provincial Plans for transit infrastructure.</p> <p>Please see comment #3 for a response on the proposed unit mix and servicing infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>The Town's Official Plan (Policy 3.5.6.4) encourages the distribution of smaller public gathering spaces (i.e. Village Squares) throughout the Downtown to ensure easy access and multiple opportunities for rest, relaxation and visual interest. While acknowledging the busy nature of Mountain Street and Elm Street, the Owner has elected to provide gathering spaces along both frontages in order to support the Town's vision for the Downtown and to foster a sense of place within an urbanized environment. These spaces are expected to complement, not compete with nearby parks and open spaces.</p> <p>The proposed development is planned to include 15 affordable dwelling units (10% of the total number of proposed units). At this time, the size and mix of these units has not been determined and will be subject to the operational requirements of the affordable housing provider that the Owner has partnered with. No parking spaces within the proposed development will be dedicated for these units. Future tenants will be screened by the Owner's affordable housing partner based on their mobility needs and with the understanding that no dedicated parking will be provided.</p>
--	---	---

<p><b>8.</b></p>	<p><b>Sydney and Corey DeMarke - 21 Mountain Street</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns with pedestrian safety at intersection, unsafe traffic levels</li> <li>• What has been done to ensure the safety and walkability of pedestrians?</li> <li>• Concerns with truck traffic and plans to reroute the traffic</li> <li>• Encourages growth but expect safety to be improved</li> <li>• Concerns with privacy and view into their backyard due to the height</li> </ul>	<p>Please see comment #1 for a response regarding the traffic impacts of the proposed development and planned pedestrian realm improvements.</p> <p>With respect to privacy, the proposed development incorporates a number of setbacks in order to limit impacts onto surrounding properties, including overlook and privacy concerns. In this respect, it is noted that the upper levels of the proposed building (levels 4 through 7) will be separated from the nearest house-form buildings (some of which have been converted to non-residential uses) on the opposite side of Elm Street by a distance of over 28 metres. The separation distance of these upper levels to the residential dwellings on the opposite side of Mountain Street is over 41 metres. In both cases, these separation distances exceed the height of the occupied levels of the proposed building (26.7 metres to the top of level 7). It is our opinion that these separation distances are more than sufficient to mitigate any privacy or overlook concerns.</p>
<p><b>9.</b></p>	<p><b>Zach - 45 Mountain Street</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agrees with other comments</li> <li>• Concerns with the height of the building proposed</li> <li>• Concerns with losing the small town character</li> <li>• Concerns with increase in traffic</li> <li>• Concerns with compounding issues</li> <li>• Concerns with the bus</li> <li>• Would be in favour if it were shorter</li> <li>• Concerns with impacts on the escarpment – would be more supportive if these were more considered</li> </ul>	<p>Please see comment #1 for responses regarding the preservation of character of the Downtown and the traffic impacts of the proposed development.</p> <p>Please see comment #2 for responses regarding the height of the proposed development, the Regional/Provincial Plans for transit infrastructure and the evaluated visual impacts with respect to the Niagara Escarpment.</p>
<p><b>10.</b></p>	<p><b>Kevin L, Harmony Group Companies, 37 Main Street W</b></p>	<p>While the proposed development is for a larger building than was previously approved by the OLT, we note that</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports residential intensification when done sustainably</li> <li>• Proposal is not sustainable</li> <li>• Developer is pushing the envelope again</li> <li>• Concerns with the parking ratio and the change from OLT decision, shortfall of parking – puts burden on downtown residents and businesses</li> <li>• Proposal goes far beyond what OLT supported</li> <li>• Opinion that Council was threatened with litigation to approve the project</li> <li>• Defer to decision until various studies are completed – parking, downtown reimaged</li> <li>• Wants Council to be held to same standards as previous developers – height, parking, etc.</li> <li>• Concerns with public parking downtown and private properties using the parking</li> <li>• Wants the development to be slowed down and more public consultation to occur</li> </ul>	<p>the increase in development size is relative to the increase in property size that occurred when the Owner acquired 23 Elm Street. In addition, as noted in previous comment responses, the Owner has revised the proposal to have a height of 7-storeys which is consistent with the height previously approved by the OLT.</p> <p>Please see comment #2 for a response regarding the proposed parking rate.</p> <p>The Official Plan amendment and rezoning application for this site is subject to standard approval timelines as set out in the <i>Planning Act</i>. Specifically, as set out in Section 22, if an approval authority fails to make a decision on such an application within 120 days after it is deemed complete, an applicant may make an appeal to the Ontario Land Tribunal on the basis of a non-decision. On this basis, the Applicant has been in a position to appeal the application since November 2025. Notwithstanding, they have elected to continue working with Town staff in an effort to resolve the application.</p> <p>While Town-led initiatives, such as the Official Plan Review, are being undertaken concurrently, the Town is still required to complete a review of the subject application as directed by the <i>Planning Act</i>.</p> <p>With regards to public consultation, the Town and Owner have engaged in significant consultation that exceeds the minimum requirements set out in the <i>Planning Act</i>. Prior to the submission of the subject applications, the Applicant hosted a pre-application community open</p>
--	--	---

		<p>house on October 4, 2024. In addition, the Town hosted a pre-application Public Information Centre meeting on December 4, 2024. The Statutory Public meeting was held on September 17, 2025.</p>
<p>11.</p>	<p><b>Councillor Freake</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expressed the need for more housing due to employment increases expected</li> <li>• Outlined commitment to growth and intensification of Grimsby</li> </ul>	<p>The councillor’s comments are noted and we concur with the need for more housing in the Town. The proposal will make a significant contribution to the Town’s housing targets, including the provision of new affordable rental dwelling units.</p>
<p>12.</p>	<p><b>Member Drew</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like more information on environmental considerations (green infrastructure)</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed development incorporates a number of design elements to support its sustainability. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The adaptive reuse of the existing heritage buildings on-site;</li> <li>- A compact built form;</li> <li>- Consideration for green roofs;</li> <li>- Facilities to encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation;</li> <li>- Consideration for bird-friendly design;</li> <li>- Biodiversity in new plantings; and</li> <li>- Consideration for green infrastructure and stormwater management best practices where appropriate and feasible.</li> </ul> <p>These elements will be further explored in collaboration with Town staff through the future Site Plan Control application.</p>